REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 20-25, 27 and 30-38 are currently pending. Claims 20 and 34 are independent. Claim 34 is hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 20-22, 24, 27, 30-35 and 37-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,731,904 to Judd (hereinafter, merely "Judd") in view of European Patent Application No. 0 515,728 to Knapp (hereinafter, merely "Knapp") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,880,695 to Brown (hereinafter, merely "Brown").

Applicants submit that a person skilled in the art would not combine the three documents of Judd, Knapp, and Brown because the combination lacks motivation. Applicants respectfully submit that the instant Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of

obviousness. Applicants submit the combination of references does not render the invention obvious.

As under stood by Applicants, Judd does not discloses some of the features of independent claims 20 and 34, and Applicants agree to the interpretation of this document by the Examiner except in one feature. Judd does not explicitly disclose an active reflector with receiving means for receiving signals from a first mobile terminal and transmitting means for transmitting the received signals to a second mobile terminal. Judd is generally directed to a repeater for repeating signals between a base station and remote units, such as handsets, cell phones and so forth. The described embodiments and given examples are directed to the repetition of signals between a base station and remote units. The only mentioning of a communication system which enables a direct communication between mobile units is in column 6, lines 59 to 61, namely the Bluetooth system. However, Judd still does not disclose how the repeater should be structured for such an application.

Therefore, Judd does not specifically teach an active reflector with receiving means for receiving signals from a first mobile terminal and transmitting means for transmitting the received signals to a second mobile terminal, which is mounted above the first and second mobile terminals in an indoor environment to provide for an indirect line of side connection between the active reflector and each mobile terminal, and wherein the first and the second antenna are circular polarized antennas with the same polarization direction.

As under stood by Applicants, Knapp relates to a wireless indoor data relay system, whereby ceiling mounted transponders communicate with each other on the basis of IR light or microwave signals. In Knapp, the system is designed as a wireless LAN system, in which the ceiling mounted transponders enable a connection between workstations on the floor

and a computer serving the stations (see Fig 1 and column 2, line 56 to column 3, line 5). The general description of the embodiments relates to the use of IR light. In case that the transponders are embodied with antennae, some kind of baseband processing (frequency-down conversion) is provided (see column 4, lines 16 to 19). Therefore, although Knapp teaches transponders, which are ceiling mounted above communication terminals, the transponders do not enable a direct communication between the terminals in the indoor environment. As stated above, the transponders enable a communication between each terminal and the central server serving the LAN system. Consequently, the transponders have separate down-link transponder sections for providing inbound and outbound LAN connections to the workstations on the floor (see, column 3, lines 56 to 58 and column 4, lines 25 to 27).

Applicants submit there is no motivation to combine Judd and Knapp. Even if a person skilled in the art would combine both documents, the combination still would still not obtain an active reflector with receiving means for receiving signals from a first mobile terminal and transmitting means for transmitting the received signals to a second mobile terminal in an indoor environment, whereby no baseband processing is comprised, as recited in claim 20.

As understood by Applications, Brown relates to a repeater station having circular polarized antennas, whereby a first antenna and a second antenna are each circularly polarized in the same direction. However, the repeater station of Brown is part of a wireless communication system and provides a repetition of signals between a base station and one or more fixed or mobile subscriber units (see column 3, lines 18 to 28). However, Brown does not disclose that the repeater station should comprise receiving means for receiving signals from a first mobile terminal and transmitting means for transmitting the received signals to a second mobile terminal in an indoor environment.

Given the different structural layouts described by Judd and Knapp, a person skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine both disclosures.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 20 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 20, independent claim 34 is also believed to be patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 20 and 34 are patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: Thomas F. Presson

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800